

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mikal Majeed; Ruby Majeed,)	C/A No. 3:13-2820-JFA-SVH
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Leon Lott, Elected Official; Richland County)	
Sheriff's Department; Roberts Towing &)	
Transport, LLC;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiffs have filed this action against the defendants alleging various violations of their constitutional rights. The plaintiffs have also filed a motion seeking a temporary restraining order (TRO) to prevent the defendants from further harassment while this action is pending.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that this court should deny the plaintiffs' motion for a TRO. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation and without a hearing.

The plaintiffs were advised of their right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. However, the plaintiffs have not filed any objections and the time within


¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

which to do so has now expired. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Magistrate Judge has thoroughly analyzed the motion for a TRO under the appropriate standards of law and opines that the plaintiffs have failed to show that they are clearly entitled to the relief sought. This court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. The Report is adopted and incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, the plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 19) is denied. The Clerk is directed to return this file to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Joseph F. Anderson, Jr." in a cursive script.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge

December 30, 2013
Columbia, South Carolina